IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE C.V.RAMULU

WRIT PETITION NO : 328 of 2000

Between:

G.Kamalamma, W/o. Radhakrishna,
S.V.School for the Deaf, Tirupathi.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 Tirumal Tirupathi Devasthanams, Rep. by its Executive Officer,
Tirupathi.
2 The Joint Executive Officer, T.T.Ds Administrative Buildings,
Tirupathi.
3 The Devasthanams Educational Officer, Tirumala Tirupathi Devasthanams,
Tirupathi.
4 Smt.N.Venkataramanamma, Assistant,
S.P.Girls High School, Tirupathi.
5 Smt. B.Lakshmi, Assistant,
S.V.Deaf School, Tirupathi.
6 Smt.M.Bharathi, Telugu Pandit,
S.V.Deaf School, Tirupathi.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a Writ, Order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the Memo Roc.No.D4/20346/DEO/97 dated 13-1-2000 issued by the 3rd Respondent as arbitrary, discriminatory and illegal and consequently direct the Respondents to consider and Promote the Petitioner to the post of Principal in the Deaf Schools of the TTDs in the existing vacancy in accordance with her seniority in the feeder category and in terms of the A.P.Handicapped Welfare Services Rules issued in G.O.Ms.No.13 WDCW & LD dated 17-1-1992, and as per the Memo Roc.No.D4/20346/DEO/99, dated 3-12-1998, of the 3rd Respondent and

with all other consequential benefits including notional seniority.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.V.JAGAPATHI

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 to 3: MR.A.RAMALINGESWAR RAO

The Court made the following :

ORDER:

The learned counsel for the petitioner states that this writ petition has become infructuous in view of the promotion of the petitioner in pursuance of subsequent proceedings Roc.No.D4/20346/DEO/97 dated 15-03-2001 issued by the respondent.

However, from the record it looks that the petitioner was successful in stalling the appointment of the fourth respondent.

Hence, the Writ Petition is dismissed as infructuous with an observation that dismissal of this writ petition as infructuous does not prevent the respondents from appointing the fourth respondent, if she is entitled for appointment legally. No order as to costs.

_____

C.V.RAMULU, J.

Dated 15-06-2005.

SKMR

..... REGISTRAR

To

1 Executive Officer, Tirumal Tirupathi Devasthanams,
Tirupathi.
2 The Joint Executive Officer, T.T.Ds Administrative Buildings,
Tirupathi.
3 The Devasthanams Educational Officer, Tirumala Tirupathi Devasthanams,
Tirupathi.

2 CD copies